

- (6) Validation of *Donax variabilis* Say, 1822 (Bivalvia). Z.N.(S.) 1923
- (7) Designation of a type-species for *Cosinocyathus* Bornemann, 1884 (Archaeocyatha). Z.N.(S.) 1924

c/o British Museum (Natural History),
Cromwell Road,
London, S.W.7, England
5 October 1970

MARGARET DOYLE
Scientific Assistant
International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED RECTIFICATION OF HOMONYMY
BETWEEN SPHAERIIDAE IN MOLLUSCA AND INSECTA. Z.N.(S.) 1892
(see volume 26, pages 235—237)

By David Heppell (*The Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh*)

I should like to register my support for the proposal by Dr. A. H. Clarke concerning the competition in homonymy of the name Sphaeriidae in Mollusca and Insecta. This matter was briefly referred to in a recent revision of the names of the British Sphaeriidae (Mollusca) by Bowden & Heppell (*J. Conch.* 26 : 239, 253—254 (1968)). The authors agreed with Baker's findings that under the terms of Article 40 Sphaeriidae must take priority as of 1820. As the name cannot be maintained unemended in both Mollusca and Insecta it does seem logical to keep the original spelling for use in Mollusca both on the grounds of priority and frequency of use.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSAL BY NIELS L. WOLFF TO DESIGNATE A
NEOTYPE FOR *PHALAENA XYLOSTELLA* LINNAEUS, 1758. Z.N.(S.) 1906
(see present volume, pages 60—62)

By E. C. Pelham-Clinton (*The Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh*)

I wish to support Dr. Wolff's proposal which would result in the retention in their present usage of two extremely well-known names.

The following points need emphasis:

1. As pointed out by Wolff the insect at present known as *Plutella maculipennis* Curtis is a widespread pest and its extensive literature has almost all been published under that name.
2. The name *Phalaena xylostella* was never up till that time used in the sense suggested by Bradley.
3. The original description provides conclusive evidence of the species (i.e. the *Lonicera* species) intended by Linnaeus and any supposed type-material which contradicts this must be regarded with suspicion. Neither of the species concerned would ever feed on the foodplant of the other.
4. There is no reason at all for Bradley's suggested change other than the existence of the supposed "types".